M 2024
Restricted
Firefly House, 5th tape, third series (7 tapes)
Sunday May 16, 1971

Mr. Nyland: So, we'll assume everyone is here. There are more today, which is quite right because we are, with this little series of seven, at a different place. We've had four, and I hope we can have three more. It is, as it were, a turning point, because in the first four I believe I've said what I wanted to say regarding foundations for Work, and attitudes, and what is involved in trying to answer questions and, in general, about one's own attitude for Work, to prepare in such a way that you can answer such questions.

Don't think that it is necessary to answer questions when you feel you are incapable. Only try at certain times to say things the way you feel they could be expressed for the benefit of someone who might ask a question. And as a resultant benefit for yourself, to have to formulate certain thoughts and ideas which you have not as yet clearly formulated for yourself. That, of course, is the particular advantage of an exchange.

But now, as it were, I would like to turn these meetings over to the members. And I will be only here to answer certain questions that you need or wish clarification on, which perhaps I can help you with. And that it's not up to me to maintain the meeting. It's up to those who now come and want to ask. And, I've said it already before, that if there are no questions that are worthwhile, then there is no meeting, because I will not be further encouraged to keep on talking.

There will be a time that I will not talk anymore, and you have to realize that at such a time, you will be on your own feet. In order to prepare for such an eventuality, I have

definitely in mind to cover, as much as I can, the different facets of Work on oneself and to see what is necessary for the freeing of oneself from the bondage of the Earth. And whatever I can contribute to that, I believe I have contributed really more than enough in that sense, in talking about it, even to the extent that what I have said is, perhaps you can call it to some extent even 'intimate.'

There is no particular reason why I should disclose certain intimate experiences of my own—that is, there is no particular reason that perhaps you know. There is only one reason that I feel has any value, which is that I almost beg you to consider Work. I lean over backwards to try to drag out of you, or to stimulate in you, a real desire for your own life, simply because I believe in that, and I definitely believe in the necessity, that each person should face this particular problem in their own life. And I will go almost to any length to illustrate or to tell you, or to remind you, or to hope to kindle within you a certain fire which I believe must be there in each man. But, when the fire is not there, there is a time when I will stop putting any kind of fuel, or wood, on a fire. And I will definitely leave you alone.

Look at it in that sense, if you will, that actually we are getting together now, as it were, for a kind of a seminar, of an exchange of ideas on the level where you live, and to see if we can maintain it. If we cannot maintain it, we will not make further attempts. I will not talk or explain, unless it is in relation to what you have thought about, what you want to know, what you try to formulate, and on which you hope we can have a discussion.

I suggested last week that perhaps, when you are by yourself, you write up certain questions and make it clear to you what you really want to ask, and that there is no objection that when you have such a piece of paper, that you read them off. But it is quite definitely up to you. Now, if you have questions, let's talk about it.

Yea.

Fred Goodall: In, in my own Work I, I want to have something in me that, that is aware of my life, and this is what I want to talk to other people and, and I want to be able to, to do that in such a way that I can be clear about the method of Work, but still have the emphasis on that. That's it.

Mr. Nyland: So, the question is, how to be that way.

Fred: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: And the answer, of course, is obvious: For yourself, to know what Work means in your life. So the question relates, simply, to your own statement, and if one wants to study the possibility of what is meant by Work and the acquisition of dexterity, then it is your duty to find out for yourself if that is clear or not. It is not necessary to have a general statement, that that is what you wish. I think that is, of course, always the assumption: that one Works, and that in Work one finds certain possibilities for oneself. And then one believes that it might be useful to someone else, maybe in similar conditions or who has problems more or less like yours, or even problems which may be different but still, in principle, are the same because each person is bound by the laws of the Earth. It is up to you decide what you wish to talk about.

Fred: Through, through efforts and wanting to make that as, as well as I understand what Gurdjieff explains as Work, I've experienced...I've experienced something existing then that is Aware of my life, and it has only really ever happened several times. It's still that, for me anyway, I believe that to be the aim of, of Work is to have that, that kind of a way for me.

Mr. Nyland: I think it's right, Fred, for yourself to have that as an aim. But now, when you are confronted with having to answer a certain question, can you, at that time, elucidate your aim in sufficiently clear language, and convincing enough, so that someone else who may have asked the question about what is Work, or what do I do, that you then can convince them—or, at least that you can affect them. That is the problem.

Now, I believe that the sense of a meeting of *this* kind is to bring up at what particular time you may have been confronted by a question, that you answered it and that afterwards you may have thought, "Was my answer right or not," or "Should I have used a different kind of language"—whichever way, is my answer suitable enough for the kind of a question that was asked. Then it becomes practical. I hope you understand what I mean.

Fred: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: We are not here to discuss, for oneself, one's own attitude, or the advisability and the desirability of Work. That is assumed.

Fred: What, what I need to be asking, is that...like...what I said, that I tried to talk about it, and I, I tried to talk, answer a specific question by talking about the difference between an Awareness, Awareness of my life and Observation of my form. And, and I don't think I've ever done it right.

Mr. Nyland: Do you think that the people who ask questions at the present time should be even given that kind of information?

Fred: That's partly what I'm asking this for.

Mr. Nyland: I'm afraid, Fred, that so often we start to talk—and I've mentioned it before—that we talk, you among yourselves and in meetings, about a variety of different concepts that we have talked about over the several years that we have had meetings, and I've warned about that. I've compared it to the very beginning when I started to have meetings and talked about Work, and that in such meetings the principles were correct and expressed in a certain way, and surely not with all the paraphernalia which afterwards—from a psychological standpoint or a description of where Work fits or even including the different states of other people; that only came in a much later period. That I think that at the present time regarding the meetings we have—and that is the reason I constantly emphasize the necessity of talking about Work and not to philosophize—that we

as yet don't adhere enough to that simplicity. But instead, and it's very tempting, one wants to talk a little bit about something that you have heard also, and usually quite recently.

Now, for instance, take the problem of form and life. Of course, in my opinion, it is true. But how can I expect anyone to understand anything about form and life when they haven't had any idea about Consciousness. I think it's a concept that cannot be understood by any unconscious person. And if you...you must remember, that if you see the sequence of certain meetings, I can start out with a very simple way of how to describe this or that, and gradually elaborate and end up with a tremendous edifice of psychological intricacies—relationships, things where they belong, going off into a little theory and comparing it with all kind of things of natural phenomena only to elucidate what was the original question really aimed at. But the answer is not in what I say at the end. The answer is in the very beginning—of giving a little task, or standing still, or going through a door, and then say, "What is there, at that moment, of this little 'I,' and to what extent have you made an attempt to create it?" And that it is necessary, for a very long time, to keep on talking simply to those who are new.

Now, if there are people where the newness has worn off and they have gone through the difficulties of wanting to Work and actually accomplished something or had certain experiences, then you become open to much more information. But not in the beginning. Form and life, for an unconscious person, are the same. The same way as physical and feeling centers are connected and the same. There is no way for any unconscious person to have even an idea that they could be separated. And even if he would like to try it because he has heard about it, he will be completely failing to be able to make any difference between the expression of the feeling and the state of the body. I cannot unconsciously conceive of life separated from the form. For me, form always must exist in

my unconscious state of thinking. And that's why I wouldn't even mention it. You understand what I mean.

Fred: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Don't make your answers too 'high,' as it were. I think there is a great difficulty for anyone who Works and finds certain beautiful concepts which engage him and where he sees a relationship for himself in his own life. The temptation is to wish to talk about it. And he will have to use words that are based on his own experience, and he has not as yet made any kind of a groundwork for someone else to experience such words in the same way. And the temptation is so, so obvious. Because what engages one, when it is beautiful you would love to tell people about it. But we find that, in ordinary life, the same way. I may be enthused about reading a book and I hope that someone also could like to read the book when I say it's so beautiful, and then they read it and they say, "What is that book, what is it?" And I feel ashamed that I have even talked about it.

I think it is necessary to know at what level a certain question happens to be, and not to go above that level in your answers. Answer the 'stupid fool,' as it says in the Bible, in accordance with *his* wisdom. You are not allowed...you are allowed a little bit, just a little, to indicate the direction where whatever the state is that a person is in could go. A little bit more. That is the means for a teacher, to be just a little ahead so that he can have respect, and he can then give perspective to the person who asks. But don't go too far away. A teacher should still keep his hand touching the person who asks. A teacher is not a person who sits already on a throne and tells from authority—high up. A teacher is not like God, in that sense. A teacher is a common person, just a little ahead of whoever wants to ask a question. He may know more, and for himself he may know already higher mathematics, but his job is to teach ABC. And he cannot go too far. The reason he can a little, is to open perspective and desire for something that is just a little further than the realm or the

framework in which the question happened to be.

Alright?

Fred: Yes.

Len: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yea.

Len: Uh, I believe that I'm beginning to understand now, how to begin, when I Work, to have something take place. But there's not enough of those kind of attempts during the course of the day. And I want to know how, how to build something more of a constant desire for that, rather than...you know what I mean?

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Len. I know what you mean. I know also that the temptation is there, when one wants to talk to others, that you perhaps go a little bit further than your own experience will allow. It can be done, and it can be understood to some extent, but I can talk about higher mathematics without really knowing what are equations of a higher order. But, it is not convincing enough if I talk that way. When I feel, in talking to someone, that perhaps I transgress and I go a little bit too far, I have to be honest and shut up. I should only, would wish for myself, to give what is my own experience, and then I can talk about it convincingly. If that means that the experience will allow me not to talk too much, simply because I don't know what I would be talking about it, that would be an impetus for myself to Work—when I feel that teaching, or telling about Work, is a requirement.

It depends on the person himself, and his own honesty. If he knows that he should, really, in order to answer a question, that he should know more, or have experienced more, then, if he wants to continue to teach, he has to Work more. And that stimulus can be with one during the whole day, having in mind that is an aim I have. And it's quite right to have that aim. It is not illegitimate that one wants to be able to talk to others—particularly when, when one talks, one realizes that in the formulation you already solve your own

problems to a great extent.

But, I think the emphasis for really Working is not in the desire to communicate Work to someone else. I think the motivation for one's own life, regarding Work, is always based on the realization of the state in which one is. And in which way you want to describe your own unconsciousness, that is entirely up to you to see what is there in yourself, as a personality, lacking that you feel ought to be filled, or for which you would wish to Work.

If I discover, in attempting to tell people certain things that I really don't know and it goes a little bit over my head and that I assume that they will understand well enough and I can get away with it, and if I am really a little dishonest about it, it turns in, towards myself, and I say, "What kind of a person are you, talking about things you don't know? Are you really honest with yourself?" And the result, after such consideration, is: "I better go and look up this and that. I haven't read All and Everything for quite some time and someone made a quotation and I nodded my head and said, 'Oh sure,' but I really didn't know it any more. Someone made a remark and I said, 'That experience is worthwhile,' and I really don't remember that experience of my own. I only was prattling a little bit and repeating what someone else had said, but it was not my own." And I really, honestly then, I come to a conclusion that I have no right to talk about it.

I think the emphasis, for a person's wish to Work, is exactly that he sees what he is and he has, with that, a certain measure that he believes in and which, in a general way I called last night 'Harmonious Man'—and I also started to compare it to a state of Awakening. Without describing such states, I'm very much aware of the wish to have that state. And then I will follow the rules for ordinary Work, which is just opposite from the description of how I would be—and the opposite being, then, that I accept what I am. And this gives me the strength of wanting to find out what it is with me that *I* know, that *I*

understand, that *I* actually have said *I* can talk about, that I can tell others I say, 'convincingly.' It is an interchange between the wish to communicate and the wish to understand, for oneself, what one is communicating. And the emphasis all the time should be on one's own wish to have more and more understanding.

Questioner: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yea.

Questioner: I would like to understand better the relationship between trying to be open to other people and Working on myself by Observing my body.

Mr. Nyland: Not at the same time.

Questioner: I can't do both at the same time?

Mr. Nyland: No.

Questioner: What is the value of being open to other people, then?

Mr. Nyland: The value is, that you see certain forms of life as expressed in different manifestations which, when you are open and not critical, can digest. And the value is, moreover, that when you make that attempt, that you catch yourself constantly being critical about them. I think what one derives from it, is a great deal of self knowledge as a result of the knowledge or the appearance of other people being communicated to you—when you are open. I think it relates completely to what one is oneself, to what extent your openness can even be heard by that what happens to someone else, or what someone else is sending to you. An enormous amount of criticism that there is in certain people about any kind of a behavior form of someone else about which they don't know anything at all, than just have a certain prejudice. Or, by the association which takes place in every person, that they immediately cannot see Objectivity as it ought to be accepted, but that their associations prevent them from being honest.

The relationship that is established, when one is open to the behavior of someone else,

relates to one's own manifestations and the kind of reception any kind of impression makes on oneself. When someone talks to me, or I see something, and that kind of an impression reaches my brain in some way or other—or it can reach even my feeling in a more or less indirect way—right at that point, when it enters into my personality, there is always ready anything to criticize, to misinterpret, to associate, to have prejudice, to have anything that is contrast to that what I should receive as an ordinary fact. And immediately, when such facts come into me, I start to paint them and look through them with colored glass, and I cannot see straight because of my own conditioning.

Now, it is true for other people. For some people it's worse than for others—it depends a great deal on the way one is perhaps educated, or the way one has been protected, or the way one has lived one's life—but it happens to every person. And in reverse, when a person talks to someone, even wishing to talk about himself and saying that he is really the worst sinner on Earth, when he says it, he thinks about what he is saying and he has already an opinion that the way he says it is really commendable. And that he loves himself for being able to say so well that he is a sinner. It is a terribly stupid kind of an affair, of an unconscious state of a man, when he has lived his life and has been accumulating associations one after another, that at a certain time when he wishes, he cannot even be free from anything of his own. And whenever he has to use words, he becomes involved in that and he judges, within himself—even when he says, "I am humble," that I say, "Don't you think I said that very well?" He says that to himself. "Didn't I express the word 'humble' very lovely? So emphatic. So honest. So sincere." And all through that little process, I start to admire my humbleness.

This is the way one finds out, when the opinions of others, or the appearances in the outside world, starts to affect me, that I have to have a balance within myself from where I can judge such an appearance—or whatever is the influence that I receive. It always relates

to oneself, where one is at that moment and to what extent you are able to cope with that what is given from the outside world towards you. And when it happens to be a particular person, perhaps it leads to any kind of a discussion or even argument. When it is an animal, you don't have to worry too much about it, but still, it is life in a certain form, and one looks at the form and tries to see what is really the value of such life in that form.

We are filled with prejudices. Completely up to your neck, filled. Your head is filled with it. Everybody—don't make, don't think it's an exception. We are lousy with all kind of negative thoughts. And we must know that, because we do talk about it once in a while, and we say, "Goddamn it, how self loving I am." And even in that, when I express it, I hope that God hears it so that He can say, "Boy, you are alright because you dare to say that. You come and sit in my right hand." And all I deserve is a kick in the pants.

This is exactly what Work *can* give one. But it does require a tremendous amount of honesty. And when one wants to emphasize constantly the necessity of the acceptance of oneself as one is, without any criticism, this problem of Impartiality is one of the most difficult problems in the whole sections of Work. One cannot be Impartial with one's ordinary mind, and the sooner one finds that out the better it will be, because then it shows, for oneself, the absolute necessity of the creation of something that is different from one's ordinary mind, as it is now functioning. One receives, by being open, a great deal of self knowledge from someone else to be applied to oneself.

Marjorie: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Marjorie: The question of elaboration on the answer, you talked about earlier, I think a year ago, when the nucleus was started, and you spoke about elaborating for oneself. And I know in my experience, with the tape answering, I answer a question in response to, in response to a need, and I...and you said sometimes, when you heard them, that I could

have elaborated. And, I could have, but I don't want to. Because if I did not act on it...

Mr. Nyland: No. That's right. But, you see, answering on a tape is a little different from answering in a group. In a group, when you have a chance to see the face of someone, you will know when to stop and not elaborate further. When you are answering a tape, even if you try to be present in that meeting, it's impossible to see the reaction of what you are saying. And therefore you have a little bit more freedom to elaborate, because they will be able to take it or not take it. But unfortunately, you will not know. In that way, when one elaborates and gives more perspective, then it can help for oneself really to come to a certain conclusion which is stimulated by that kind of a question. And you start on answering the question first in its simplicity by giving an answer, and the elaboration is only to place the question and to give perspective to the questioner. You use, then, simply the question to elaborate, for yourself, and to sketch in a panorama which you would like to be understood by the person you are answering. But, you have it not in your power to know that actually the picture that you are drawing is going to be understood by them.

Marjorie: Well, I worry about...if I have a concept that I want to convey, it, it always appears to me, and it's much clearer, if it's left in a very basic form and not elaborated.

Mr. Nyland: It depends on the way one wants to teach. I don't think there are any particular rules for that. Because, a person who wants to say certain things may have a method of wanting to hammer it in, and another person may have the method to just opening it up and leaving it and hoping that the person who listens is going to elaborate on his own. Now, there are two different methods, and in between there is a variety of elaboration up to a certain point, and elaboration a little bit further. And I say, there is no particular rule for that, than only what one feels is right under the circumstances.

If your feeling is you've said enough, then of course you must stop. If you feel that that what you still could elaborate may be helpful to a person—even if, at the moment

when they hear it, they may not hear it entirely but afterwards, if they listen to it again or think about it again and then it might enter into you—one cannot really say at what point a person must stop. I think it is a matter of: 'I have said enough,' or, 'I could say this and that but I will leave that 'til tomorrow,' or, 'I could eat more'—you know what is called, in French, the 'honor of the plate,' *honeur du plat*—that is, you eat, and you eat just enough, and you always leave a little bit on the plate as an honor to the plate. Even if you have appetite, it may be, at a certain time, very good to leave it the way it is because it is enough—and enough is enough. Now, that is another way: of gobbling it all up and cleaning it, the plate, so completely clean; like a cat—a cat doesn't understand the honor of a plate. But in polite society it is understood, and in answering tapes or in giving answers, it is definitely understood. If the stimulus is sufficient to start the person going in the direction in which you want him to think, then you can leave it alone, and you can hope that he will continue.

But there is also, connected with that, so many other different, almost I would say 'vices' on the part of a person, that he is enamored by his own words or his own thoughts and ideas and becomes completely forgetful about who he is talking. And, of course, he over talks. There are others who will say, "It ought to be enough, because in *my* opinion, that kind of a person should now start to think because *I* have given him enough to get started with." And not knowing how he looks or what he is—that is the difficulty with answering a tape, and even in an, in an ordinary group—you may have said already, long ago, what you wanted to say and you keep on elaborating, much to the boredom of the rest, who cannot be interested any more.

You know, I, I say again there are no particular rules for that, than only what one feels. And I think that the experience teaches much more, that one knows what one can do and has done, and whatever may have been done in the past, that you knew it was not

right. Then you profit by it whenever you are faced with the same situation.

Side 2 Alright, Dick.

Dick: Uh huh. Someone, someone who came to the Group II for the first time--a girl in the meeting said that she felt that the meeting was very dead and that she wished really that she could do something, and said, in the way in she expressed it, "here and now." I was very reluctant myself to say anything about "I Am" at that time in the meeting, and fearing that it was, it was going, it was going too far, and not knowing if I could talk to her...

Mr. Nyland: Did you think the meeting was dead also? Did you agree with her?

Dick: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Why didn't you say so?

Dick: I guess I tried to animate it in whatever way I could.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. Good. But first acknowledge that it was dead. "Sure. You're right. It's dead. What's the matter with us? Why don't you and I bring some life into it." If she has an opinion that it is dead, she must know what it might be, in this 'here and now,' to be more alive. I think it would be very helpful for the rest of the group to know that your opinion is also that it is kind of dead, but it puts you under an obligation immediately to be more alive. And the hesitancy of wanting to be critical, that one doesn't want to many times because you don't know what to say and explain. But I would agree with them and I would say, "Yes, it is dead. Unfortunately. Where is it? How come? Haven't we got any life left? Why do we sit and talk about Work like this, with long faces and this? Why, haven't we had some experience in, in a good situation or a joyful one and still remembered that God existed?" Introduce some kind of a different element and start with you, your voice, to lift it up and say, "You think we are dead? Not at all! We're not dead!" It will create an entirely different something.

I do not know how, how it ended. Is she coming back or is she dead? [laughter]

Dick: No, she's coming back.

Mr. Nyland: Then you have an obligation to feed her.

Dick: See, she asked...she'd been very much involved with something else in which a discussion of Awareness for her remained a confusion with watching in the ordinary sense, and having had no experience and having had no, having made no attempts to create an 'I,' I really, I really was at a loss to go from there, and trying in an ordinary way to make it more alive.

Mr. Nyland: Can you talk about Work to someone who doesn't know anything about it, and where you want to explain how to Work on yourself? Can you do that in such a way that it is alive?

Dick: I tried once. People said that it was...I didn't feel, [giggle] it was not [giggle].

Mr. Nyland: Well, could you try it on her?

Dick: Yes, again.

Mr. Nyland: Because, particularly if you feel that she's confused and maybe you can dispel the confusion. Couldn't you just say to her, "I think you are confused about Work. Let me now tell you how it is. Now, for instance, and here we are, etc., etc., and..." Could you do that?

Dick: I'll try.

Mr. Nyland: The emphasis is on you. When you agree with her that it was of course dead, then you have to put life into it. Even at great cost. You should not allow a deadness to continue. I hope she still will be there when you come back.

Dick: Yeah, she'll be there.

Mr. Nyland: Oh, good. Then try to tell her...You know what Work means every once in a while when you want to explain it, that you recall, of course, how difficult it was for you to understand ordinary concepts. Even if one talks about Objectivity, there is no way that you

can measure it, and if you remember that, how difficult it was and what mistakes you made that afterwards you considered, "Well, how stupid, but you couldn't help that;" it's the same with the other. Even if her 'here and now' and so forth is already...starts to smell of something else—for me, you know, when that word is used, then I think there is already a little prejudice—then I would say, "What have you been studying? Were you interested in Jung, let's say, or Gestalt, or what? What do you know about 'here and now ?' What is 'here and now' for you? And we want to have a little bit more aliveness in it. Now, let's talk about it."

You understand what I mean.

Dick: Yeah.

Doug Holmes: My question is about answering a Group III meeting, and the difficulty of staying away from a discussion of Work and yet trying to relate people's lives, the way they look at their lives, to the ideas of Gurdjieff.

Mr. Nyland: Well, you know, Doug, the difficulty is always to mix up a Group III with a Group II...

Doug: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: ...and, the Group III is an introduction with Gurdjieff's ideas as a background, but never on the foreground, and that, in a Group III, you can talk about Work to stimulate an appetite but not really go into detail about what is meant by Work.

The existence of Work, that there is a possibility of what is called the 'only way,' that there is a way out, that there is hope, that there is a chance for anyone who wants to find out that he can find out a solution, is more than enough for a Group III, because then you will encourage them that they, instead of reading Zen, they might read All and Everything, and may have some questions about what is meant by Work on oneself. But I would not go into too much detail, and again it is a difficult thing, how far does one go, does one

want to go, or is one allowed to go; it depends on the person. There may be people who come to Group III who already have gone through life, suffered this and that, have looked at a variety of different things and are quite knowledgeable and did not find anything that really satisfied them, and then hearing about Gurdjieff and hearing from someone perhaps who was enthusiastic about it, they come with a very great openness to want to know, "What is it, now, that they, this group, can give to him." It's quite a different situation from someone who comes in timidly and who sits down at the edge of the room and somewhere and shifts and is nervous and doesn't dare to ask a question and still you know that you need something but she doesn't know herself what it is really that she needs.

And how to answer a variety of different types of people who all might come to a Group III, and the problem of course is much worse when you have to face them. How can one talk to an audience of hundred people. How can you reach them—if you set that up as an aim, that at least 50% you would like to give something to or at least you would like to arouse in them a certain desire to look further—how can one do it with 50 different types! And the more there are of that kind, and not knowing them, the more you are forced to stay superficial, until they ask the questions and then, of course, you know a little bit what they want.

But in general, in a Group III, to conduct it, I think is very, very difficult. We flop over into a description of Work so soon, without having laid any foundation whatsoever. And the poor people don't even know who Gurdjieff is, and you tell them about Objectivity and Work on yourself and you start already immediately with Impartiality and perhaps even with Simultaneity before you know it: "Observation; you must do this, that, and that is Work." And they are not prepared for Work.

Group III has a curiosity that makes them come, and a curiosity can be kindled and maintained and then changed over into a desire and, I hope, in the end, ending up in

Group I with devotion. But you still have a large group of people just coming from the outside world, from the street, and reading and having read and knowing a little bit and thinking an awful lot about themselves. Why would they be interested in Gurdjieff, unless you can make it palatable enough, that it has something that they haven't thought about? But you don't want to go into detail at all, and I would stay exactly on the superficial side, and if there is any indication for anyone who wants to know more, there is Group II.

The reason why Group II is really not successful in Sebastopol is simply because Group III is taking over the duties of Group II. That is the reason. And I've warned them about that in the beginning, saying that I don't think you have the material for a Group II. But, of course, it was all right; we tried it and, how many come to Group II? Two or three. That's not it. You can call it a Group II for the people who are already on the Land and so forth, and then becomes an adjunct to Group I, but Group II in Sebastopol was supposed to be an adjunct to Group III, to take care of the overflow from Group III, of people who wanted to know something about Work, and it should have been kept in Group III just superficial, and whet their appetite so that they were forced to come to Group II. So, it is a little difficult situation at the present, and, although I can understand the temptation of wanting to talk about Work in a Group III, it really does not belong there.

Doug: It seems that what happens is that the few new people who come will sometimes not, uh, talk at all or talk briefly, and then people who have been there for awhile begin to talk about Work, and I think it keeps newer people from having an opportunity.

Mr. Nyland: I think that is one of the reasons. Yes. But that is inherent in having a group where you allow, constantly, new people to come in. And that also means that when a Group III really has, has people in it who want to know about Work, they should be told, "Come to Group II. Not this group. We don't want to talk too much about Work."

Try to remember, Doug, the different meetings that I've held of some kind of a

lectures that we had in San Francisco. How long it took me to talk in the meeting, talk about Work. Do you remember, probably you do, in San Francisco, but there were a hundred and twenty, hundred fifty people sitting in Clara Street. And for the whole first half hour, three quarters of an hour, I talked about ordinary life. Almost 'boringly,' I call it, because they came there to know something about Gurdjieff and I didn't want to tell about Gurdjieff until first the thing was straightened out, "Why talk about Gurdjieff?" When they know that they are in a terrible state and can agree with it and so forth, then you can offer a remedy. But you don't start by offering it when you don't even know what your disease is.

You agree with that, Dick? Because it is something that affects—and Ole, where are you?—it affects San Francisco, makes it difficult for Ole to answer, to give the answers on Group II, and it makes it difficult for Doug to take care of Group III.

Dick: There's only one thing. Group II has now seven people and Group III only has one, two.

Mr. Nyland: Oh! Then they have transferred.

Dick: Yeah.

Mr. Nyland: Now, then it is in the right direction, I hope. I'm probably talking about the time when there were only two or three, which was for quite some time, right? I didn't know that, Ole, that there were seven new people in the Group II?

Ole: Yeah, in this last meeting there were. Although there was no nucleus, but there were a lot of only three people from the nucleus. There were lots of new people. There is some difficulty with the, with the answering of Group II, uh, that I would like to talk about and we are talking about Sebastopol. Uh, a new person will bring up, "I made an attempt," and then talk about some feelings that they had, or some experience that they felt that they had, and then the discussion will concentrate about feelings, an area which I can't really say

whether or not the person had some experience or not, and I don't think that it is for me to say anything about the experience, but I feel, from my own experience, that unless I go back to the simplicity of trying to make an attempt to Work and then to talk specifically about what it was that I tried to do, I get lost. And I have a feeling that they get lost very quickly. How do I...

Mr. Nyland: I think, Ole, when you have a feeling that they are just talking a little bit around Work, in a Group II you have a right to say, "Where is Work?" I think the emphasis—when that comes from your tape and it is, uh, heard—should be then on the nucleus: "Where were we? While we listened to that meeting, why didn't we notice the same thing, or, if we did, why didn't we say something about it?" I think that is the function of a person like Ole, being outside and seeing that and saying it, that then the nucleus says, "What was the matter with us?" And it will emphasize the necessity for the nucleus really to get busy and to talk about Work. But if there are only...that you say there were only three of the nucleus? Did you say that?

Dick: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Ole?

Ole: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Only three? Where was the rest.

Ole: Well, there is one here.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, that is O.K. [laughter] We are, we'll allow him to be here. [laughter]

Ole: They weren't there.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah, but that still leaves a couple of other.

Ole: Yeah. They weren't there. They just weren't there.

Mr. Nyland: All right, it's a problem for the West Coast.

Dick: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: But I think it can be solved quite well by placing the emphasis where it belongs, and that will help Doug in answering Group III. I'm glad that there are only three new ones. Not that, I wouldn't like more new people in Group III, but when there are more people who are interested in wanting to know something about Work and go to Group II, I think it's a very good, uh, very good, uh, sign.

Doug: Should I say on the answer, uh, to the—let's see—to the people who come to Group III although who are also in Group II, who've been there for awhile, and when there are no questions from new people, they begin to talk about Work experiences...

Mr. Nyland: No.

Doug: ...should I include in my answer. Leave that alone and..

Mr. Nyland: That's right. That belongs to Group II. Don't mix it up. It throws the really new people in Group III completely off. Huh? You understand what I mean. Why talk to someone who wants to find out a little bit about a whole lot of so-called 'activity' of Work on oneself when it is a completely closed book to them. I think you are right, Doug, if that is your impression, that you can say that.

Michael Near: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Michael Near: In San Francisco, we combined the two groups, both Group II and Group III.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah.

Michael: Uh, there's a number of problems that I'm running into. Uh, one of them is the very thing you are talking to now, which is, uh, discussing Work and specific attempts, discussing tasks, uh.

Mr. Nyland: You see, the difficulty with San Francisco came up much more since we moved to Sebastopol and the Land, and there was such a desire to have, the Sebastopol, all

three groups; a Group III as well as a Group I on the Land and then the additional Group II. That changed the picture of San Francisco, because the recruiting was then, for Sebastopol, from the surrounding there, and not so much from San Francisco, and for that reason, San Francisco II and III were combined with the emphasis on III, and Berkeley was combined with the emphasis on II. You remember? We talked about that. So, you have in San Francisco, and the way you should consider it, a Group III, and anyone who wants to know more about Work as such can go to Berkeley. That was, at the time we talked, as the reason for doing it. You remember? So, I think with that in mind, I think it is easier for you to answer. Don't allow them to give tasks in that group at all; they talk about background of Work, seriousness, honesty, ethical values, and again, as I say, that there is something in existence which we call 'Work.' And then they can be encouraged and they can read and they can bring up some questions they don't understand so that you can give just a little bit of an answer, and then say, "There is a Group II in Berkeley, go there and we talk about it." Or, "Come to the Land, come to Sebastopol. We have different groups."

Michael Near: There's another problem with that group, which is the, much of what Dick was talking about, uh, I feel, uh, there's a definite necessity to interject a level of enthusiasm, uh, an interest, inject an interest, inject a whole aliveness in the meetings that hasn't been there for an awfully long time. I feel my hands a bit tied, uh, attempting to do that by a tape.

Mr. Nyland: I don't think you can, really.

Michael: And, I see...

Mr. Nyland: No.

Michael: ...I see that the problem is that without that aliveness or without the enthusiasm in that meeting, uh, it's it's drying up there, it's uh...

Mr. Nyland: I would tell them the same way as when, if, when it does happen and, and Doug feels that, he can tell them that something is lacking. Same thing as Ole would face; there is something that should be in this Group II which isn't there. I think you should do the same thing. There is something not there that should be there, in Group III in San Francisco.

Michael Near: But, but, how can it be done?

Mr. Nyland: Let them find out. Now I'm not going to suggest what they're going to do until I would be there and talk with people because it, whatever I can say at the present time, is generality. It, that is their problem, that is their meeting. I mean, after all, we are not here simply to discuss how *they* should work. You agree with that, Dick? We are not telling you what to do on the West Coast.

Dick: Yeah, I'm afraid I said too much. I...

Mr. Nyland: Too much now?

Dick: No, I yeah, in this meeting.

Mr. Nyland: I don't think so. No. I think it is very useful.

Dick: We'll see. I wanted, I really wanted to ask about level of a meeting. That, for me, when I come here, the people I know best are in Monday night. I've known them longer. And I see something, I see something that's, to me, of real value, and I would wish that we could maintain, attempt to create and maintain something of that kind. That there are people in a nucleus who really do count on each other and can really rely on each other and can, then, talk to each other and in the meeting, though, that they can, in the meeting, feel this.

Mr. Nyland: Well, the reason for starting—you mean, now, on the West Coast, you mean that...

Dick: Yeah, I...

Mr. Nyland: ...that I have something like that on the West Coast?

Dick: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Yeah. But, for that reason we started the nucleus for Group II, and that's the proper place. It has a value even if there may not be too many people from Sebastopol; it definitely has a value for a nucleus to work out the difficulties that exist between them.

Dick: See, our tendency, without you and I, my own feeling is that you provide the fire—this, that our ordinary lives come more in the foreground than our aim, and that our aim, without the heat, is not the most important thing in our lives.

Mr. Nyland: Dick, it has to be stimulated. [chuckles] When it's there, it will start to flare up. When it isn't there, I don't know how much fuel you have to contribute first before you can light it. But I think it is there. It's just a matter of wanting to find out and trying to eliminate too much of the talk-talk in different directions. It has taken some time for the Monday nucleus, in the Monday group, to be what they are now, and we're still on our way.

Don't let's talk more about that; that is partly administration and partly difficulties inherent in groups of people. The, the emphasis of this should be on questions and answers, of what is needed for your own to, to be able to answer or to become clear how to understand what the condition is of someone else. This is really the most important thing. I don't believe it is so much your own knowledge; I think that can be, even, limited. The understanding is, of course, the mixture in yourself of knowledge with a feeling and an emotion producing, then, the state of a level or a Being-level on which understanding takes on the intellectual aspects of a Being, and it includes, then, in the understanding, the totality of the application of having eaten that what was knowledge and converted into something that helps, now, to support the level of the Being.

When one faces a group of people who ask questions, it is not so much your

knowledge that will help you, and it is not that kind of an explanation as of course you might put in very good words and without any fault, but it is no guarantee that a person actually needs that. You can always refer them to something else like reading All and Everything and quotations and even listening to some of the tapes. But that won't do it. Something has to be kindled in a man, that there is a need for himself to become interested, and the knowledge will be added to that. The interest for a person is based on a consideration of his life as it is and then having a wish to change it; and that wish has to be very sincere. And the communication towards others is always to emphasize, "Do you have that wish, do you understand what I mean when I talk about the possibility of an evolution?" And not at all in a mental way, but in something that he said "I wish to grow." And many times the growing is not even expressed that way but it is like a child holding up its arms and saying, "I want to grow up as big as," let's say, "Father." That comes from something else; that comes from an aliveness in the person; that is why the person in the group there, when it is dead, is quite right to say, "It is dead."

And we've had many meeting also that are dead, and you know that. And what to do about it is not that easily found, but it can be, it can be found by beginning not to be dead oneself. And if you keep on, even in talking even in a nucleus, about the things that interest you only and become a little superficial, even in philosophy that you think is very deep, it doesn't help the meeting as a whole. What is needed is an expression of yourself of being there, alive and it is this aliveness that will be catching; that is the communication; that is, you might call it, the 'disease'—something that is really affecting you, overflow bacteria from you, of aliveness of some kind. Not necessarily detrimental, but alive. It's far better to be alive and sick, and sick instead of being not sick and dead.

And that I feel, you know, you still have not enough questions, you still haven't thought, you still haven't considered this meeting your own. You do not come as yet, and

for heaven's sake, please write up questions during the week that concern you, about your Work or that what you want to talk about for other people. Make questions! Bring them here, read them, because I will not continue these meetings unless there are questions of that kind. We can talk a little bit about Sebastopol and so forth, that's O.K., but I want to know what is it that is alive in you. When there is something alive it's worthwhile to talk; if there isn't, don't, for heaven's sake, come and sit too much like bags of potatoes. It's not worth it, it's not worth your time. Time is very important right now. You must start to realize that. Because if *you* don't take the time, the time will be taken away by the cultivation and the culture and the civilization of this world without you having any chance to hold onto it. It will be taken away and you will be subject to such currents simply because there is nothing in you to counteract them. That is why time is essential; now; not ten years from now. Now! This is the time you must Work.

So, we'll meet again next week, but please bring questions. Goodbye. Have a good meeting, with yourself.